

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claim 27 is currently being cancelled.

Claims 17, 22, 24 and 26 are currently being amended.

Claim 32 is currently being added.

This amendment and reply adds, cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding, canceling and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 6, 7, 10-12, 17, 21-26 and 32 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Non-Enablement:

In the Office Action, claims 17, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, because “readable medium” is not disclosed in the specification. By way of this amendment and reply claims 17, 25 and 26 now recite a “computer memory”, whereby support for that feature can be found, for example, on page 16, lines 1-4 of the specification. Thus, presently pending claims 17, 25 and 26 now fully comply with under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 6, 7, 10-12, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 09-205390 to Ozaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,525 to Tarusawa et al.; claims 17 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Tarusawa et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,630 to Langberg et al; claims 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0142699 to Jollota et al.; claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ozaki in view of Jollota et al. and further in view of Langberg et al.; and claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action correctly recognizes that Ozaki does not describe the claimed display content switch unit. However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Tarusawa et al. teaches such features.

In more detail, the claimed display content switch unit is configured to **sequentially switch the display content by the display unit periodically**. Turning now to column 5, lines 29-67 and Figure 1A of Tarusawa et al., that portion of Tarusawa et al. merely describes switches SW1 and SW2 that are used to switch antennas A1 and A2 in and out periodically, in order to provide a space diversity system. This portion of Tarusawa et al. is not at all directed to switching a display of a display unit, but rather it is directed to sequentially connecting two antennas to a band-pass filter system in order to achieve space diversity, in which nothing is to be displayed in the system of Tarusawa et al. Note that there a display unit is not included in the system shown in Figure 1A of Tarusawa et al.

Accordingly, since Tarusawa et al. does not teach or suggest a display content switch unit that is configured to **sequentially switch the display content by the display unit periodically**, independent claim 1 is patentable over the combined teachings of Ozaki and Tarusawa et al.

Accordingly, independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims 6, 7 and 21, are not anticipated by Ozaki.

Presently pending independent claims 12 and 17 recite similar features as discussed above with respect to claim 1, as method steps, whereby independent claims 12 and 17, as well as their respective dependent claims 23 and 25, are patentable over the cited art of record. It is also noted that neither Jollota et al. nor Langberg et al. (cited against other claims) rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Ozaki and Tarusawa et al.

With respect to independent claims 22, 24 and 26, those claims now recite a sequential display on a display unit **only in a numeric format and then only in a non-numeric**

which merely discloses the use of LEDs to show a link quality as a "bar" on a display, or by any of the other cited art of record.

New Claim:

New claim 32 has been added to recite additional features of the sequential display contents, whereby such features are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record, when taken as a whole.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 11, 2008

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819